



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,509	04/16/2004	Steven Bailey	MS304069.01 / MSFTP620US	1955
27195 7590 01/09/2009 AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 127 Public Square 57th Floor, Key Tower CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER EHICHIOYA, FRED I	
			ART UNIT 2169	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/09/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/826,509	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BAILEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FRED I. EHICHIOYA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2169	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) FRED I. EHICHIOYA. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Francis Dunn (Reg. No. 57,972). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 January 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 13 and 31.

Identification of prior art discussed: Julien and Benayon.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A proposed amendment to claims 1, 13 and 31 was discussed. Applicant's representative (Mr. Dunn) pointed out the differences between the instant invention and cited prior arts with emphasis that the prior arts of record do not teach "aggregate size change that occurs on a database data page". Examiner informed Mr. Dunn to formally submit the proposed amendment in order to review it and the prior arts before a decision could be made.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Fred I. Ehichioya/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2169